

Hon. Mr. SCOTT — We would only have to speak with more care. We know that in regard to the House of Commons it is the unrevised edition that is read by the public. The members of that House have not the opportunity of revising any reports that go to the public. Speeches are delivered late at night. They are rapidly transcribed by the stenographers into long hand, sent over the wires and pass into the printers' hands, and appear the following morning. The members no doubt find that they are made to say a great many things for which they would not like to be held responsible.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY — That is only a summary.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT — It is only a summary that the public read. The general public do not read the revised reports of the House of Commons debates. The speeches which the public read are the summaries flashed over the wires and the unrevised edition of the House of Commons debates. The only speech that is ever carefully prepared and delivered to the country is the Budget speech. When any member of the House delivers an important speech he takes care to revise it, and have it published on his own account. But if hon. gentlemen want to revise their speeches before they are published I can only say that they will be very old news before they appear in print. I know I am one of those who, after delivering a speech, do not wish to read it again, and I think most hon. gentlemen who have to speak very often, find it too much labor to read over their speeches unless they want them to be made of record. So far as the transactions of this Chamber from day to day are concerned, it is really impossible that they can go to the public in a short time if we are going to revise them. One gentleman is quite ready with his speech, and another may not be able to look at his for some time, and in that case the whole report must be kept back. The revision before publication is impracticable. As a member of the Committee, I shall be exceedingly glad if the House can suggest some system which will be more universally approved than this.

*Hon. Mr. Scott.*

Hon. Mr. DICKEY — If it be true, as the hon. gentleman says, and I have no doubt that his opinion is correct, that the general public will not read the *Hansard*, why is it that we are going to such an enormous expense to circulate a *Hansard* over the country.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT — When I speak of *Hansard*, I use the term in contradistinction to the sheets containing the unrevised edition which is distributed promptly. In addition to our suggestions, I hope next year we will see our way to the adoption of a summary that will be inserted in four or six leading newspapers. I understand that it will not cost a very large sum of money, and there will be only the embarrassments of the preparing of that summary. But that is a matter entirely independent of this *Hansard*. We want an official report. Hon. gentlemen are constantly turning up the speeches delivered in former sessions, and we cannot carry on the business of the country without being bound by our statements. What we did and said last year are matters of importance in the debates this year, and it is for that reason that we ought to have a correct *Hansard* to which we can refer at any moment.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH — I must say I prefer the existing arrangement to the one that has been proposed. I think we secure greater publicity by the publication of our debates in the *Citizen*, because that newspaper exchanges with all the leading journals of the country. Under the new system the reports which go to the public cannot well be accurate, at least as regards dates and figures. These inaccuracies will create erroneous impressions which cannot easily be removed. Once an inaccurate report is published it will get into other papers, it will be almost impossible to correct it, certainly the public will not see the corrections, and there will be little satisfaction in having it thereafter appear in proper shape in the *Hansard* volume simply as a record. Considering the amount of money which we are expending on this service (and I think it is well expended), I do not think that the proposed arrangement will be satisfactory or will give the same publicity that is secured by the present system. My conviction is